DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 224 375 HE 015 638

AUTHOR Christal, Melodie E.; Hector, Henry
TITLE Faculty Retention in the Florida State University System: Implications for Policy.
PUB DATE 1 Oct 80
NOTE 27p.; This paper was identified by a joint project of the Institute on Desegregation at North Carolina Central University and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education at The George Washington University.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Rank (Professional); *Age Groups; *College Faculty; Employment Opportunities; *Employment Patterns; Faculty Mobility; Higher Education; Minority Groups; Personnel Policy; Professors; *State Colleges; Teacher Employment; *Teacher Persistence; Teacher Retirement; Teacher Salaries; Teacher Supply and Demand; Tenure
IDENTIFIERS *Florida State University System

ABSTRACT

Retention rates of professors, associate professors, and assistant professors in the Florida State University System (SUS) for 1977-1978 and 1978-1979 are analyzed. Separate retention rates for each rank by tenure status and age group are presented. The nontenured assistant professors have the lowest retention rates (about 85 percent for both time periods). Data are presented on the total number of new positions to be filled by both the SUS faculty within the system and faculty who could be hired from outside. It is only at the assistant professor level where it becomes possible to hire a sizeable number of new faculty from outside the SUS. Using the age categories established by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), it is suggested that the the Florida SUS faculty is a "mature" faculty. As the older and more expensive SUS faculty retire, they will be replaced by less expensive younger faculty. The data suggest that there will be adequate annual retirements to keep a steady tenure ratio, adequate number of positions available for hiring young faculty, and no increased compensation costs due to an aging faculty. Although the turnover rate is sufficient for the entire SUS, it may not approximate the faculty turnover rate at each of the nine universities. It is suggested that an early retirement policy might have some merit if it were designed to achieve specific goals at the various institutions. It is proposed that a projected modest growth in new positions over the next 5 years will reduce the system's chance of increasing minority representation at the tenured professor and associate professor level in a short period of time, unless minority faculty are hired at the tenured full and associate levels. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED224375

FACULTY RETENTION IN THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM: IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY

Melodie E. Christal

Henry Hector

Planning and Analysis

State University System of Florida

October 1, 1980

AE015638

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Melodie E. Christal

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

NORTH CAROLINA CENTRAL UNIVERSITY
DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA 27707

INSTITUTE ON DESEGREGATION

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON HIGHER EDUCATION/INSTITUTE ON DESEGREGATION

COOPERATIVE PROJECT

This paper has been identified by a joint project of The Institute on Desegregation at North Carolina Central University and ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education at George Washington University. The purposes of this project are to identify, collect, and make available literature concerned with

(1) the problems of minority students in higher education in general and
(2) the problems of desegregation in historically black colleges and universities in particular.

New published and unpublished materials are reviewed and recommended by participants of the Institute on Desegratation's Interinstitutional Research Group (ID/IRG) for acquisition by ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. An annual bibliography of this material will be published under the names of ERIC and the Institute.

Various types of materials are being solicited, especially unpublished and unindexed materials, as well as publications, produced by faculty and staff members. Included in these may be unpublished faculty studies, institutional research studies, master's theses, monographs, papers presented at professional meetings, articles from general and scholarly periodicals, and conference and workshop proceedings not covered by ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.

To be acceptable for inclusion in the ERIC system, the materials submitted for evaluation must be (1) reproducible, (2) of sufficient substance to be of value to practitioners, researchers, scholars, and others, and (3) not repetitive of materials that are already currently available.

If additional information is needed about this cooperative project or the criteria for selection of materials, please write or call the Director of the Institute on Desegregation at 919/683-6433, North Carolina Central University, Durham, North Carolina 27707.

NORTH CAROLINA CENTRAL UNIVERSITY IS A CONSTITUENT INSTITUTION OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

Introduction: Factors Influencing the Faculty Retention Rate

The State University System (SUS) in Florida is interested in determining the retention rates of its ranked faculty: Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor. The reter ion rate is influenced by the present retirement policy, tenure policy, faculty mobility, student enrollment growth and other minor factors.

If the faculty retention rate is high, several problems can arise. Universities will be unable to hire greater numbers of younger faculty, minorities or women. As the average age of faculty rises, the total salary and compensation expenditures will probably become higher since older faculty tend to have higher average salaries. It is believed that the Florida SUS may be facing some of these problems.

In 1978 the Federal Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 was amended to extend the mandatory retirement age from 65 to 70 in private and nonfederal public employment and to completely remove any mandatory retirement age for federal employees. After some controversy, a compromise was made that defers the mandatory retirement age of 70 for professors until 1982, as it is believed that university faculty already have job security with tenure.[1] In the Florida SUS there is no mandatory retirement age.[2] If large numbers of the faculty chose to delay their retirement, there would be fewer available spaces for new faculty to be hired.

---

[1]Carl V. Patton. Academia in Transition, Abt Books, Cambridge, 1979.

[2]Florida Administrative Code, Chapter 6C-5.11.

The rate of enrollment growth in Florida will also have an effect on the need for faculty. In Florida, an enrollment growth of approximately 7 percent over the 1979-80 enrollments is projected for 1985-86.[3] At this time enrollments are expected to level off if there are no policy changes which might have an effect on the enrollments. This is in contrast with a 22 percent growth for the same length of time from 1973-74 to 1979-80.[4] As the rate of enrollments decline, the need for additional faculty members will also decline. Nationally the downturn in the number of traditional college-age students will have an immediate impact on the enrollments and by 1988 a substantial decline is indicated.[5] Fewer positions nationwide will also affect faculty turnover and new faculty members will only be needed to replace faculty who retire or who die.

The current tenure policy in use for the SUS follows the AAUP guidelines. To be considered eligible for tenure, a faculty member must be a full-time faculty member, and be ranked an assistant professor or above. The decision to nominate a faculty member for tenure is normally made during his fifth year, although there are some exceptions to this rule. By the end of six years of service in a tenure-earning position, a faculty member should be recommended for tenure or notified of termination.[6] Once a faculty member has been granted tenure, he is considered a permanent faculty member until he voluntarily resigns or retires, is dismissed for just cause, or dies.

---

[3]Office of Planning and Analysis, Preliminary SUS Enrollment Projections, P&A/mcs: 6/20/80.

[4]Office of Planning and Analysis, State University System History Full Headcount Enrollment, P&A/dcm: 1/14/80.

[5]Lyman A. Glenny. "Demographic and Related Issues for Higher Education in the 1980's," Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 51, No. 4, 1980, pp. 18-27.

[6]Florida Administrative Code, Chapter 6C-506.

TABLE I

RETENTION RATES FOR SUS FACULTY AT THE RANKS OF
FULL, ASSOCIATE AND ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
1977/78 and 1978/79

	1977 to 1978	1978 to 1979
Full Professor		
Tenured	94.97	94.70
Nontenured	80.00	87.20
Total	94.08	94.30
Associate Professor		
Tenured	96.92	95.83
Nontenured	88.09	89.25
Total	94.87	94.28
Assistant Professor		
Tenured	97.80	94.06
Nontenured	85.36	84.94
Total	87.21	86.37
TOTAL RETAINED FACULTY	91.54	91.26

P&A/HHh/9/19/80

There is a growing concern over awarding tenure. Large numbers of tenured faculty will require a long-term financial commitment. A department with a high percentage of tenured faculty, coupled with a high retention rate, will restrict the hiring of new younger faculty in the future. This situation might also prevent the SUS from achieving its EEO goals.

Retention Rates in the Florida SUS

A faculty retention rate was calculated for the SUS for the years 1977 to 1978 and 1978 to 1979. A separate retention rate for the ranks of full professor, associate professor and assistant professor by tenure status for each age group is in Appendix A, pages 1 and 2. The retention rate for the SUS is derived by matching the employed faculty by age, rank, and tenure status for 1977 with the faculty in 1978. The number of faculty who are retained in 1978 is divided by the total number in 1977 to give the retention rate. Table I summarizes the retention rates for 1977 to 1978 and 1978 to 1979 by rank and tenure status. Faculty who did not match were believed to have retired, changed status (promoted or taken a job in research, etc.) or died. As might be expected the rates for the tenured faculty at the ranks of full and associate tend to be higher and more consistent than the other categories. The rank of tenured assistant professor has only slightly over 200 professors in any particular year and therefore a slight variation in the total number could create a large percentage variation. The nontenured full professor and associate professor ranks also have small numbers (full professors approximately 85 and associate professors approximately 400) from year to year. The nontenured assistant professors have the lowest retention

TABLE II

NEW POSITIONS AVAILABLE FOR HIRING FOR SUS FACULTY AT THE RANKS OF FULL, ASSOCIATE AND ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

1978 and 1979

	1978	1979
Full Professor		
Tenured	132	194
Nontenured	6	-12
TOTAL	138	182
Associate Professor		
Tenured	15	124
Nontenured	30	-69
TOTAL	45	55
Assistant Professor		
Tenured	-64	31
Nontenured	110	43
TOTAL	46	74

P&A/HHh/8/19/80

TABLE III
New Positions Available for Hiring Faculty Outside the SUS
in 1978 and 1979[1].

	FULL		ASSOCIATE		ASSISTANT	
	1978	1979	1978	1979	1978	1979
Total New Positions	138	182	176	235	212	266
Number of Associates who Changed Status or were Promoted	131	180				
Total Number New Positions Outside SUS at Rank of Full Professor	7	2				
Number of Assistants who Changed Status or were Promoted			166	192		
Total Number of New Positions Outside SUS at Rank of Associate Professor			10	43		
Total Number of New Positions Outside SUS at Rank of Assistant Professor					212	266

1. Based on Appendix B Pages 1 and 2.

TABLE IV

Age Distributions of All Faculty for 1978 by Rank

Age Category	Full Professors		Associate Professors		Assistant Professors		Total	
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
20-29	2	.14	9	.51	158	10.82	169	3.61
30-34	15	1.03	180	10.17	534	36.55	729	15.56
35-39	106	7.27	559	31.64	381	26.07	1,046	22.33
40-44	261	17.92	377	21.33	147	10.06	785	16.76
45-49	282	19.35	260	14.71	102	6.98	644	13.75
50-54	288	19.76	180	10.17	74	5.07	542	11.57
55-59	260	17.84	116	6.56	32	2.18	408	8.71
60-64	160	10.99	68	3.84	24	1.65	252	5.38
65 +	83[a]	5.70	19	1.07	9[b]	.62	111	2.37
TOTAL	1,457	100.00	1,768	100.00	1,461[c]	100.00	4,686	100.00

[a] 15 Full Professors are 70 years and older.
[b] 1 Assistant Professor is 70 years old.
[c] A total of 16 professors (.35%) stayed beyond age 69.

P&A/HH/9-11-80

rates. This rate is approximately 85 percent for both 1977 to 1978 and 1978 to 1979.

Total new positions available for hiring was calculated by adding together the vacancies created by retirement or death and the creation of new positions due to expansion of the system. Table II indicates the total number of new positions to be filled by both the SUS faculty within the system and faculty who could be hired from outside the SUS. For details concerning the totals in Table II please refer to Appendix B, pages 1 and 2.

Although it might be assumed that the total number of new positions at each rank and tenure status could be used to hire faculty from outside the SUS, this is probably not the case for the majority of positions at the full and associate level. If it is assumed that all of the faculty at the associate level who changed status were promoted to full professor, then 131 of the 138 new positions in 1978 would be filled from within the SUS (See Table III). Using the same assumption, 166 positions of the 176 available at the associate level would leave only 10 openings for hiring faculty outside the SUS. It is only at the assistant professor level where it becomes possible to hire a sizeable number of new faculty from outside the SUS.

Table IV distributes all of the SUS faculty at the rank of full, associate, and assistant in the age categories that were established by the AAUP study in September, 1978.[7] Using these age categories they established three types of faculty using percentages for each age group.

---

[7]"A Report of the AAUP Special Committee on Age Discrimination and Retirement," AAUP Bulletin Vol. 64, Number 3, September 1978 pp. 181-192.

TABLE V
Age Distribution of Tenured Faculty for 1978 by Rank

Age Category	Full Professors		Associate Professors		Assistant Professors		Total	
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
20-29	1	.08	0	0	0		1	.04
30-34	13	.95	106	7.75	22	10.05	141	4.76
35-39	94	6.82	430	31.44	63	28.77	587	19.79
40-44	249	18.06	297	21.71	28	12.79	574	19.36
45-49	265	19.22	208	15.21	43	19.64	516	17.40
50-54	276	20.02	147	10.75	31	14.16	454	15.31
55-59	256	18.57	101	7.39	16	7.31	373	12.58
60-64	156	11.32	63	4.61	11	5.03	230	7.76
65 +	69[a]	5.01	16	1.17	5[b]	2.29	90[c]	3.04
TOTAL	1,379	100.00	1,368	100.00	219	100.00	2,966	100.00

[a] 11 Full Professors 70 years and older.
[b] 1 Assistant Professor is 70 years old.
[c] A total of 12 professors (.4%) stayed beyond age 69.

P&A/HH/9-11-80

> "The first is what we call a 'balanced' faculty, one whose age distribution closely approximates the age distribution of all faculty members. The second is a 'young' faculty representative of many newer institutions which grew rapidly in the late 1960's and early 70's and attracted large numbers of Ph.D's to their ranks. The third is a 'mature' faculty representative of many established institutions which grew rapidly during the 1960's and may have achieved some of their growth by hiring experienced faculty from other institutions."[8]

According to the AAUP report, only the "mature" faculty would allow the replacement of a large proportion of older retiring faculty by younger faculty. Since the percentage of faculty in the SUS has the almost identical percentages of the AAUP "mature" faculty, the AAUP study suggests that the Florida SUS should not experience a serious problem in hiring younger faculty since the older faculty will continue to retire at a reasonable rate.

Table V includes only the tenured faculty for 1978 but uses the same AAUP format as Table IV. Full professors over the age of 50 make up 55 percent of the total full professors. Associate professors over the age of 50 are only 24 percent of the total associate professors. Although there are a total of 219 tenured assistant professors, only 29 percent are 50 years old or older. Over seventy percent of the faculty

---

[8]AAUP Bulletin, 1978.

who are sixty or older are in the rank of full professor. Only 5 percent of the faculty who are sixty or older are assistant professors. Since most tenured positions will probably become available through retirement or death, it would appear that the SUS follows a policy of promoting associate professors to full professors and assistant professors to associate professors as openings become available.

Although 90 (3.04 percent of the total faculty in 1978) professors are 65 years or older, only 12 (.4 percent of the total) remained beyond their 70th year even though they did not have to retire. Table V does not suggest that large numbers of tenured faculty will stay active beyond the traditional retirement age of 65.

If the present age distribution continued, then the AAUP report suggests that the SUS should not experience any substantial increased salary costs due to greater numbers of aging faculty remaining with SUS. The fact that the SUS is basically a "mature" faculty suggests that as the older and more expensive faculty retire, they will be replaced by less expensive younger faculty thus preventing any increased salary costs due to an aging faculty.

Implications for Policy

If tenured faculty will be retained longer, there is a general fear that several problems may arise.

1. With enrollments declining, the need for new faculty will be diminished and as a result a department will become staffed with only tenured faculty. The flow of young faculty with new research techniques and ideas will cease until the tenured faculty retire.

2. Departments staffed with senior faculty will be at the upper end of the pay scale and the lower end of the work load scale.[9]
3. Affirmative action goals will be impossible to reach because no new openings will be created.

With the passage of the federal law to raise the mandatory retirement age, many universities began to explore the need for implementing early retirement plans. By inducing faculty to retire before the age of seventy, it was hoped a university could maintain the flow of young faculty to positions vacated by retiring faculty. A survey in 1977 by Ladd-Lipset indicated that raising the retirement age to 70 "would lead to a significant number of faculty continuing past 65 years of age."[10] Since early retirement policies usually are based on economic incentives for tenured faculty to retire early, the possible increased costs make it important to assess the need for this type of policy.

William Simpson investigated the long term effects of a minimum retirement age of 70 for tenured faculty to determine what effect retirement at 70 might have on the steady state tenure ratio, the flow of new faculty into the lower ranks, and the operating costs of the university.[11] He found essentially no effect.

> "In summation, it can be said that small changes ($\pm$ five years) in the retirement age of tenured faculty

---

[9]William A. Simpson. "Steady State Effects of a Later Mandatory Retirement Law for Tenured Faculty," Research in Higher Education. Vol. II, No. 1, 1979, p. 38.

[10]David L. Spinney and Gerald W. McLaughlin. "The Use of Markov Model in Assessment of Alternate Faculty Personnel Policies," Research in Higher Education, Vol. II, No. 3, 1979, p. 250.

[11]Simpson, p. 38

> will not cause any changes in cost, tenure ratio, or flow of new faculty that could be termed disastrous by anyone but an alarmist."[12]

Spinney and McLaughlin produced similar findings. Increasing the mandatory retirement age to 70 will only slightly aggrevate the percent of faculty with tenure, the average salary situation and the number of new faculty entering the system.[13]

The AAUP reported similar results for "mature" institutions. Since "mature" facilities are in the process of becoming younger because of a continual supply of retirements which allow younger faculty to be hired in their place, the compensation costs rise least with mature faculties.[14]

The Florida SUS faculty is a "mature" faculty by the AAUP definition. This suggests that there will be adequate annual retirements to keep a steady tenure ratio, adequate number of positions available for hiring young faculty and no increased compensation costs due to an aging faculty. A study that calculates the average salaries by rank regardless of tenure status for the SUS, according to the AAUP age categories, indicates that there is little association between age and the average salaries paid in the SUS. Although retention rates and new hire rates have been calculated to use in a computer model for projecting how the SUS faculty will appear in 5, 10, and 20 years, the model is still in the developmental stage. Table II reveals that 229 (4.9%) new positions were available for hiring outside the SUS, out of the total, 4686 ranked faculty in 1978 and that similarly in 1979, 311 (6.7%) new positions were available.

---

[12]Simpson, p. 44

[13]Spinney and McLaughlin, p. 258

[14]AAUP, p. 87

This gives a two year average of 5.8% for new positions which could be used for hiring new faculty from outside the SUS.

Although the turnover rate is sufficient for the entire SUS, it is not necessarily going to approximate the faculty turnover rate at each of the nine universities. An early retirement policy might have some merit if it were designed to achieve specific goals at the various institutions. If specific departments were to be phased out to be replaced by new departments or if affirmative action goals had to be achieved in a short period of time, early retirement policies might help accomplish these objectives.

In a study done by David Hopkins in 1974 at Stanford using a faculty flow model, he found that it took ten years to achieve a goal of one minority tenured faculty member to every 16 tenured faculty under "steady-state" assumptions.

> "What is somewhat remarkable, however, is just how slowly the tenure minority component is built up: even with an extremely ambitious affirmative action program, after ten years fewer than one in sixteen tenured faculty members will be a minority person."[15]

Over the next five years there will be a modest growth in the number of SUS faculty. While minorities can be expected to flow through the system (assistant to associate and associate to full), the lack of growth in new positions will reduce the system's chance of increasing minority representation at the tenured professor and tenured associate

---

[15]David S.P. Hopkins. "Analysis of Faculty Appointment, Promotion, and Retirement Policies," Higher Education, 1974, p. 415.

level in a short period of time. However, a policy which targeted a certain percentage of new positions at the tenured full and associate level, could effect a more rapid change. For example, Table III indicates that in 1978, there were 17 new positions (7 Full and 10 Associate) available after faculty (within the SUS) were promoted. This number was 45 in 1979. If 20 percent of these positions were used to hire minority faculty from outside the SUS, approximately 12 additional minority tenured faculty could be brought into the SUS in this two year period. Hiring minority faculty at the tenured full and associate levels has the advantage of reducing the time it takes for minority faculty to fill the tenured ranks.

> "Nevertheless, the fundamental structure of a faculty personnel system would seem to assure that achieving a 'fair mix' of faculty members in all ranks is going to take a long time. For this reason, persons whose duty it is to monitor faculty affirmative action programs should resist the tendency to measure performance in terms of relative numbers of faculty in service; rather, it is the relative rates of flow (appointments, promotions, etc.) that should be observed."[16]

Conclusion

Based on the literature and the data collected, it does not appear that the Florida SUS will encounter any of the problems sometimes associated with high retention rates. However, a model for projecting the new

---

[16]Hopkins, p. 416.

positions available in the SUS in five years will be implemented to examine the implications of aging faculty. Although the system as a whole may be free from these problems, individual universities may be affected.

APPENDIX A

1977 to 1978 and 1978 to 1979 Retention Rates by Ages for SUS
Non-Tenured Faculty at the Rank of Full, Associate or Assistant Professor

Age	Non-Tenured Full Prof. Ret. Rates 1977 - 1978	Non-tenured Full Prof. Ret. Rates 1978 - 1979	Non-Tenured Assc. Prof. Ret. Rates 1977 - 1978	Non-Tenured Assc. Prof. Ret. Rates 1978 - 1979	Non-Tenured Assoc. Prof. Ret. Rates 1977 - 1978	Non-Tenured Asst. Prof. Ret. Rates 1978 - 1979
29&below	100.0	0.0	50.0	100.0	87.5	76.5
30	100.0	100.0	100.0	75.0	87.4	83.9
31	50.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	86.1	88.4
32	100.0	100.0	100.0	85.7	86.7	86.8
33	100.0	100.0	100.0	83.3	81.4	86.3
34	100.0	100.0	87.1	94.1	84.7	88.5
35	100.0	100.0	100.0	93.3	84.4	86.6
36	100.0	100.0	96.0	85.7	83.8	88.8
37	50.0	100.0	100.0	83.3	87.1	79.3
38	100.0	100.0	86.2	88.9	80.0	92.0
39	50.0	100.0	95.5	90.5	77.2	84.9
40	33.3	100.0	92.0	91.3	86.2	87.2
41	100.0	100.0	100.0	94.11	82.8	82.2
42	100.0	100.0	91.7	93.8	82.4	84.6
43	100.0	100.0	75.0	86.7	88.9	53.3
44	100.0	100.0	91.7	93.8	94.4	93.3
45	100.0	100.0	90.9	93.8	87.5	72.2
46	100.0	100.0	94.4	77.8	87.5	92.9
47	100.0	100.0	100.0	91.7	78.6	85.7
48	100.0	66.7	100.0	90.0	100.0	90.0
49	100.0	66.7	100.0	92.5	100.0	93.8
50	100.0	100.0	100.0	87.5	83.3	91.7
51	100.0	60.0	85.7	66.7	100.0	92.3
52	100.0	100.0	66.7	66.7	87.5	88.9
53	80.0	100.0	100.0	50.0	87.5	60.0
54	100.0	100.0	92.3	100.0	88.8	50.0
55	33.3	100.0	75.0	100.0	75.0	100.0
56	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	83.3	100.0
57	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	80.0
58	50.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
59	100.0	100.0	100.0	50.0	100.0	100.0
60	100.0	0.0	66.7	100.0	50.0	100.0
61	100.0	100.0	80.0	0.0	66.7	25.0
62	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
63	100.0	100.0	100.0	50.0	100.0	50.0
64	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	66.7
65	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
66	87.5	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
67	33.3	83.3	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
68	100.0	100.0	33.3	50.0	50.0	100.0
69	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
70	100.0	100.0			100.0	100.0
71	0.0	100.0			100.0	0.0
72	100.0	100.0			100.0	
73	100.0	100.0			100.0	
74&under	0.0	0.0			0.0	
TOTAL	80.0	87.2	88.09	89.25	85.36	84.94
	N=90	N=78	N=420	N=400	N=1332	N=1242

P&A/HH/9/8/80

APPENDIX A

1977 to 1978 and 1978 to 1979 Retention Rates by Age for SUS Tenured Faculty at the Rank of Full, Associate or Assistant Professor

Age	Tenured Full Prof. Ret. Rates 1977-1978	Tenured Full Prof. Ret. Rates 1978-1979	Tenured Assc. Prof. Ret. Rates 1977-1978	Tenured Assc. Prof. Ret. Rates 1978-1979	Tenured Asst. Prof. Ret. Rates 1977-1978	Tentured Asst. Prof. Ret. Rates 1978-1979
29&below	100.0	100.0	100.0			
30	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
31	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
32	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
33	100.0	100.0	90.5	90.9	100.0	100.0
34	100.0	100.0	96.2	96.2	100.0	88.9
35	66.7	100.0	96.3	98.1	100.0	100.0
36	100.0	83.3	97.9	90.2	100.0	90.9
37	77.8	93.3	94.4	98.9	91.7	94.1
38	100.0	89.5	98.8	97.5	100.0	100.0
39	96.3	100.0	99.0	97.53	100.0	100.0
40	96.9	96.8	96.5	96.7	100.0	100.0
41	100.0	95.7	96.9	95.1	100.0	100.0
42	100.0	98.3	98.6	100.0	100.0	100.0
43	100.0	95.3	100.0	94.5	100.0	100.0
44	92.0	100.0	95.9	95.2	100.0	100.0
45	95.8	94.4	100.0	93.0	100.0	100.0
46	98.0	94.0	97.8	94.4	100.0	100.0
47	94.1	96.3	97.8	98.1	100.0	100.0
48	98.2	98.0	96.0	95.1	100.0	100.0
49	98.0	98.3	97.0	97.9	84.6	100.0
50	94.2	98.1	96.9	96.8	100.0	75.0
51	98.1	98.2	94.1	96.4	100.0	100.0
52	100.0	96.4	100.0	100.0	83.3	100.0
53	96.3	100.0	100.0	93.5	100.0	100.0
54	98.5	96.6	94.4	100.0	100.0	100.0
55	97.6	98.4	96.7	100.0	100.0	75.0
56	100.0	93.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	50.0
57	98.1	96.6	100.0	97.5	100.0	100.0
58	96.8	92.5	100.0	95.5	80.0	100.0
59	92.1	96.9	100.0	96.0	100.0	100.0
60	96.9	97.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	75.0
61	92.3	90.9	100.0	100.0	50.0	83.3
62	92.3	96.2	100.0	87.5	100.0	50.0
63	94.9	87.5	92.3	75.0	100.0	0.0
64	95.2	91.7	100.0	91.7	0.0	100.0
65	85.0	76.2	87.5	90.0	100.0	100.0
66	78.9	72.2	100.0	71.4	100.0	100.0
67	91.7	81.3	66.7	100.0	0.0	50.0
68	77.8	81.8	33.3	100.0	0.0	100.0
69	54.5	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
70	75.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	100.0	100.0
71	37.5	87.5		0.0	0.0	0.0
72	100.0	50.0				
73	100.0	50.0				
73	0.0	0.0				
74&above						
TOTAL	94.97	94.70	96.92	95.83	97.8	94.06
	N=1313	N=1379	N=1397	N=1368	N=240	N=219

P&A/HH/9/8/80

APPENDIX B

NEW POSITIONS AVAILABLE FOR 1978 FOR ALL FACULTY IN THE RANKS OF FULL, ASSOCIATE AND ASSISTANT PROFESSORS

	Full Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
Total Faculty (Fall)	1403	1817	1626
Retained Faculty (Promoted or Changed Status)	10	131	166
Faculty Attrition	84	94	211
Faculty Retained at Same Rank	1309	1592	1249
Total Faculty 1978 (Fall)	1457	1768	1461
Number of New or Lost Positions Between 1977 to 1978	54	-49	-165
Positions Available for Hiring in 1978	138	45	46

P&A/HHh/9-12-80

APPENDIX B

New Positions Available for 1979 for All Faculty in the Ranks of Full, Associate and Assistant Professors

	Full Professors	Associate Professors	Assistant Professors
Total Faculty (1978)	1,457	1,768	1,461
Retained Faculty (Promoted or Changed Status)	13	180	192
Faculty Attrition	83	82	200
Faculty Retained at Same Rank	1,361	1,506	1,069
Total Faculty 1979 (Fall)	1,556	1,741	1,335
Number of New or Lost Positions Between 1978 to 1979	+99	-27	-126
Positions Available for Hiring	+182	+55	+74

P&A/hhs: 9-16-80

APPENDIX C

NUMBER OF ALL TENURED PROFESSORS 1977-1984 USING AAUP AGE

CATEGORIES USING 1977-78 RETENTION RATES

Age Categories	Actual 1977	Actual 1978	Projected 1979	Projected 1980	Projected 1981	Projected 1982	Projected 1983	Projected 1984
20 - 29	0	1	2.4	2.0	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.3
30 - 34	202	141	124.9	106.3	100.0	82.8	70.3	64.3
35 - 39	609	586	569.5	499.9	432.0	354.2	285.4	239.4
40 - 44	534	572	653.4	688.8	701.7	718	697.2	643.6
45 - 49	511	516	554.3	553.1	573.5	585.6	622.8	674.6
50 - 54	439	457	485.2	497.4	521.2	540.6	551.1	558.0
55 - 59	346	373	429.7	445.2	453.2	476.4	498.2	506.9
60 - 64	215	230	257.3	288.5	312.5	341.0	366.7	402.6
65+	94	90	95.3	116.8	136.6	150.7	157.3	160.3
TOTAL	2,950	2,966	3,172	3,198	3,232	3,251	3,251	3,251
% 50 or over	37.1	38.8	40.0	42.1	44.0	46.4	48.4	50.1

TOTAL	4,791	4,860
% Tenured	61.57	66.9

P&A/HH:jh/10-17-80

APPENDIX C

NUMBER OF ALL TENURED PROFESSORS 1985-1990

USING AAUP AGE CATEGORIES USING 1977-78 RETENTION RATES

Age Categories	Projected 1985	Projected 1986	Projected 1987	Projected 1988	Projected 1989	Projected 1990
20 - 29	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.3
30 - 34	62.3	62.5	62.9	65.0	69.1	72.1
35 - 39	220.1	210.2	195.3	187.0	187.6	190.8
40 - 44	582.7	521.0	450.8	392.6	353.6	338.4
45 - 49	704.5	714.1	731.5	717.0	674.5	623.8
50 - 54	555.4	572.9	583.9	617.0	664.2	692.0
55 - 59	517.4	538.0	552.5	563.6	573.4	573.7
60 - 64	418.5	425.4	448.1	467.6	474.1	481.0
65+	188.8	205.7	224.8	240.0	253.3	277.9
TOTAL	3251.0	3251.0	3251.0	3251.0	3251.0	3251.0
% 50 or over	51.7	53.6	55.7	57.6	60.4	62.3

P&A/TF:jh/10-20-80